

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 25-1511 FMO (AJRx)	Date	July 22, 2025
Title	Ricardo Estrada Castillo v. Varinder Singh		

---

---

Present: The Honorable	Fernando M. Olguin, United States District Judge
------------------------	--

Vanessa Figueroa	None	None
------------------	------	------

Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.
--------------	---------------------------	----------

Attorney Present for Plaintiff:	Attorney Present for Defendant:
---------------------------------	---------------------------------

None Present	None Present
--------------	--------------

**Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order Denying Motion to Remand without Prejudice [14]**

Having reviewed and considered all the briefing filed with respect to the Motion to Remand (Dkt. 14, "Motion"), filed by Ricardo Estrada Castillo ("Castillo" or "plaintiff"), the court finds that oral argument is not necessary to resolve the Motion, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); Local Rule 7-15; Willis v. Pac. Mar. Ass'n, 244 F.3d 675, 684 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2001), and concludes as follows.

On December 2, 2024, plaintiff filed a Complaint ("Compl.") in the Los Angeles County Superior Court against Varinder Singh ("Singh" or "defendant"). (See Dkt. 1, Exh. A, Compl. at ECF 10). On February 21, 2025, Singh removed the action on diversity jurisdiction grounds pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1441. (Dkt. 1, Notice of Removal ("NOR") at 1). Plaintiff then attempted to amend the Complaint in state court on March 6, 2025, (see Castillo v. Varinder, 24STCV31654, Amendment to Complaint (L.A. Super. Ct. March 6, 2025)) – two weeks after Singh had filed the Notice of Removal in this action, (see Dkt. 1, NOR), and in the state court action. (See Castillo v. Varinder, 24STCV31654, Notice of Removal to Federal Court (L.A. Super. Ct. February 21, 2025)).

Although plaintiff alleges that a non-diverse defendant is a party, (see Dkt. 14, Motion at ECF 2-3), the Notice of Removal was filed before plaintiff's attempted amendment, and therefore, the operative Complaint filed in this action has not been amended. (See, Dkt. 1, Exh. A, Compl. at ECF 10). Thus, there is no basis to remand the action because plaintiff is a citizen of California, (Dkt. 1, NOR at ¶ 4), and Singh is a citizen of Washington. (Id. at ¶ 5). Given that "[a] party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 15, plaintiff may file a First Amended Complaint, adding any relevant defendants, within one week of this Order. Once plaintiff has done so, plaintiff may file a new motion to remand.

**This order is not intended for publication. Nor is it intended to be included in or submitted to any online service such as Westlaw or Lexis.**

Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 25-1511 FMO (AJRx)	Date	July 22, 2025
Title	Ricardo Estrada Castillo v. Varinder Singh		

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand (**Document No. 14**) is **denied without prejudice**.
2. No later than **July 30, 2025**, plaintiff shall file a First Amended Complaint that adds any relevant claims and defendant(s).
3. Plaintiff may file a motion to remand after filing the First Amended Complaint.

	00	:	00
Initials of Preparer	vdr		